

REMARKS

This reply responds to the Office Action mailed on June 27, 2008.

Claims 1 is amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-9, 27-33, and 59-66 are now pending in this application. The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter is introduced. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found in the specification, for example, at page 14, lines 14-19 and page 14, lines 4-5.

In the Drawings

Figure 8A is amended to illustrate one or more datums as disclosed in the specification at page 14, lines 4-19. No new matter is introduced.

In the Specification

The paragraph beginning at page 14, line 14 is amended to change “not shown” with respect to one or more datums to a reference number. No new matter is introduced.

Specification Objections

The title of the invention was objected to on the ground that it was not descriptive.

Applicant traverses the objection of the title. No reason is provided in the Office Action that explains the position stated in the Office Action that the title is not descriptive. However, Applicant amends the title to further prosecution of the instant application.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections of the title and allowance of the claims of the instant application.

First §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Booth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,747,101; hereinafter “Booth”). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of these claims.

Applicant cannot find in Booth a disclosure and a suggestion of a method of packaging including using one or more datums to align an array of conductive elements formed in an adhesive layer, where the one or more datums are disposed on a first side of a finished wafer such that the array of conductive elements formed in the adhesive does not contact the one or more datums, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that Booth does not teach each and every claim element of claim 1, that Booth does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 1, and/or that Booth does not teach each and every claim element arranged as in claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that Booth does not anticipate claim 1 and that claim 1 is patentable over Booth.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 2 and 3 are patentable over Booth for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Further, in view of the additional features of each of these dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified above.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claims 1-3, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

Second §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 27, 28, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,874). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of these claims.

Applicant cannot find in Smith a disclosure or a suggest of a method of packaging including forming an array of conductive elements within a substantially independent film-like adhesive layer such the adhesive layer and the array of conductive elements form a structure essentially consisting of the adhesive layer and the array of conductive elements and, after forming the array of conductive elements within the adhesive layer, applying the adhesive layer having the array of conductive elements within the adhesive layer to a first side of a finished wafer, as recited in claim 27. In the Office Action, Smith's dielectric layer **10** is referenced as an adhesive layer, where "the dielectric layer desirably is formed from a material such as an elastomer, gel, foam or other material having relatively low resistance to deformation." (See

Summary, column 2, lines 51-54) However, Applicant submits that an elastomer having relatively low resistance to deformation does not disclose or suggest an adhesive elastomer. Applicant notes that Smith discusses at column 15, lines 6-10 that a compliment layer 354 may be arranged to adhere to surfaces, where compliment layer 354 is a “B-stage” material, which does not disclose or suggest an adhesive elastomer.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Smith does not teach each and every claim element of claim 27, that Smith does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 27, and/or that Smith does not teach each and every claim element arranged as in claim 27. Thus, Applicant submits that Smith does not anticipate claim 27 and that claim 27 is patentable over Smith.

Claims 28, 30, 31, and 33 depend from independent claim 27. Applicant submits that claims 28, 30, 31, and 33 are patentable over Smith for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 27. Further, in view of the additional features of each of these dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified above.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claims 27, 28, 30, 31, and 33, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

First § 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 4, 6-9, and 59-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in combination with Kovac et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,639). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of these claims.

Applicant cannot find in the combination of Booth and Kovac, as proffered in the Office Action, a disclosure or a suggestion of a method of packaging that includes applying an elastomer adhesive in fluid form to a first side of a finished wafer, as recited in claim 4. In the Office Action, it is stated that “Booth . . . fails to disclosure the use of an elastomer material . . . Kovac (170) utilizes an elastomer material . . . obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the wafer package of Booth by forming its encapsulating material as an elastomer in order to accommodate CTE mismatch as taught by Kovac (Abstract).” Applicant disagrees. As taught by Kovac, low viscosity compliant filer 170 is injected after conductive material 110 has

been formed contacting terminals 140 with “flow of the liquid into the channels 117 between the adjacent pads 110,” where the “liquid elastomer 170 tends to remain between the chip and the substrate because of the surface tension forces.” (*See Figure 2 and column 6, line 57 – column 7, line 18*). Since the use of a liquid elastomer as taught by Kovac is based on the injection of the liquid elastomer in the structure having conductive elements previously formed with a chip coupled to a substrate, Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would be directed away from using the liquid elastomer as taught by Kovac in the method of Booth. Thus, Applicant submits that the teaching of Kovac does not make obvious the features of claim 4 that are missing in Booth. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over Booth in view of Kovac.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 4, Applicant submits that claim 59 is patentable over Booth in view of Kovac. In view of the feature of independent claim 59, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified above. Claims 6-9 and claims 59-66 depend from independent claims 4 and 59, respectively. Applicant submits that claims 6-9 and 59-66 are patentable over Booth in view of Kovac for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 4 and 59. Further, in view of the additional features of each of these dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified above.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claims 4, 6-9, and 59-66, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

Second §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in combination with Hoang (U.S. Patent No. 6,201,301). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of this claim.

Applicant submits that combining Hoang with Booth, as proffered in the Office Action, does not cure the deficiencies of citing Booth with respect to claim 4. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 4 is patentable over Booth in view of Hoang. Claim 5 depends from claim 4. Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable over Booth in view of Hoang for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 4. Further, in view of the additional features of this dependent

claim, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified above.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claim 5, and reconsideration and allowance of this claim.

Third §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in combination with Booth. Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of this claim.

Applicant submits that combining Booth with Smith, as proffered in the Office Action, does not cure the deficiencies of citing Smith with respect to claim 27. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 27 is patentable over Smith in view of Booth. Claim 29 depends from claim 27. Applicant submits that claim 29 is patentable over Smith in view of Booth for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 27. Further, in view of the additional features of this dependent claim, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified above.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claim 29, and reconsideration and allowance of this claim.

Fourth §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in combination with Yoshizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,406; hereinafter "Yoshizawa"). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of this claim.

Applicant submits that combining Yoshizawa with Smith, as proffered in the Office Action, does not cure the deficiencies of citing Smith with respect to claim 27. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 27 is patentable over Smith in view of Yoshizawa. Claim 32 depends from claim 27. Applicant submits that claim 32 is patentable over Smith in view of Yoshizawa for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 27. Further, in view of the additional features of this dependent claim, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim may be allowable for one or more reasons in addition to and/or in alternative to those reasons identified above.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claim 32, and reconsideration and allowance of this claim.

Assertion of Pertinence

Applicant has not responded to the assertion of pertinence stated for the patents cited, but not relied upon, by the Office Action since these patents are not relied upon as part of the rejections in this Office Action. Applicant is expressly not conceding they have any pertinence and reserves the right to respond more fully should any of them form a part of some future rejection.

Reservation of Rights

Applicant does not agree with one or more comments in the instant Office Action. However, Applicant has limited the discussion of the Office Action rejections to such discussion as is necessary to efficiently expedite the prosecution of the abovementioned application. Applicant reserves the right to further address the comments of the Examiner at a later date if necessary. Further, Applicant reserves the right to swear behind reference cited in the Office Actions of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (612) 371-2157 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 371-2157

Date 29 September 2008

By David R. Cochran
David R. Cochran
Reg. No. 46,632

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 29th day of September, 2008.

Name Amy Moriarty

Signature [Signature]